

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 31 2007

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed September 18, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks are submitted in response thereto. Claims 1-15 are pending in the application.

The rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laksono in view of Eames is respectfully traversed. The invention is a replacement for the prior art system requiring an individual set-top box on every television monitor. Claim 1 recites apparatus for providing video content to a plurality of televisions located at a site comprising 1) a centralized gateway at a centralized gateway location within the site for connecting to the plurality of televisions and to a digital network supplying packet-based video content according to a plurality of selectable video feeds, and 2) a plurality of port extender modules located separately from said centralized gateway, and each associated with a respective television. The centralized gateway has a plurality of decoders decompressing respective data streams and a plurality of television adapters generating television signals usable by a television in response to a selected uncompressed data stream. In order to allow a user to select desired content at a particular television, the port extenders associated with each television provides selection data to the processor in the centralized gateway via a local-area network interface. The television signals are not processed in the port extenders. Decoding and decompression are handled in the centralized gateway rather than locally at each port extender/television.

In contrast, Laksono distributes packetized digital data from a multimedia server. As disclosed in paragraphs [0082] and [0083], a user makes a channel selection at a client module 14-22 which is relayed to multimedia server 12. The data for the selected channel is multiplexed with other channels selected by other client modules to generate a multiplexed stream of data. The stream of data is sent to all the client modules. Each client module has to extract its desired channel from the multiplex stream. Contrary to the statement in the rejection that the server in Laksono generates television signals usable by

-2-

(Serial No. 10/004396)

the televisions without further processing, it is clear that Laksono requires the client modules to perform extraction of a digital signal from a multiplexed stream and to convert the extracted data into a signal usable by a television. The rejection acknowledges that the multimedia server in Laksono lacks television adapters. Without such adapters, the multimedia server of Laksono cannot generate the television signals as required in claim 1.

Eames merely shows decoding of video signals for combining them onto a shared media. Therefore, Eames fails to strengthen the rejection or to correct for the deficiencies of Laksono. The combined teachings of Laksono and Eames fail to produce the claimed features. Moreover, the references do not suggest the claimed apparatus nor do they make it obvious to try. Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-13 are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 14 recites 1) a centralized gateway having television adapters and 2) port extender modules communicating with the centralized gateway. The port extender modules communicate with remote controls for identifying selected video feeds. The centralized gateway retrieves the selected video feeds and generates at least one corresponding television signal at the television adapters, wherein the television signal is reproducible by the television without further processing. The television adapter sends the television signal to the television over a television supply cable such that the television signal is not processed by the port extender module. Thus, claim 14 likewise distinguishes from Laksono and Eames for the same reasons as discussed regarding claim 1. Therefore, claims 14 and 15 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 1-15 are also allowable over Laksono and Eames for the reason that Laksono is not available as prior art. Submitted herewith is the declaration under 37 CFR §1.131 of Harley R. Ball as representative of the assignee. The declaration shows that the present invention was completed prior to the earliest filing date accorded to Laksono which is May 24, 2001. Prior to that date, the inventors had submitted an invention disclosure and were discussing production and marketing of the invention with Motorola. The

invention disclosure indicates that the inventors considered their invention to have been reduced to practice. Nevertheless, it is not necessary to reach such a conclusion because the detailed drawings and explanation of the invention provided in the invention disclosure would convince a skilled artisan that the invention would work as intended without experimentation. Consequently, Laksono is not prior art.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, claims 1-15 are now in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Mollon
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,123

Dated: October 31, 2007
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fifth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(734) 542-0900
(734) 542-9569 (fax)